When symbols loop; our creative impotence, nostalgic certainty, and fear of imagination

Benjamin James

December 12, 2025

There comes a point in the life of a civilization when its symbols, having served faithfully for generations, are promoted from tools to guardians. They are no longer asked to explore, only to protect. Their job ceases to be the opening of possibility and becomes instead the maintenance of order. At this stage, our culture congratulates itself on maturity. We have, after all, replaced myth with explanation, wonder with documentation, and uncertainty with consensus. What we do not immediately notice is that we have also replaced creativity with repetition, imagination with reassurance, and living symbols with looped ones.

A looping symbol is easy to recognize once one knows what to look for. It does not point beyond itself. It does not invite interpretation so much as enforce recognition. It reassures the audience that reality is exactly as previously described, that nothing essential has changed, and that no unsettling novelty need be entertained. The symbol becomes self-referential. It says, in effect, "You have seen this before, and you were right then." This is not symbolism in the older sense, where meaning overflowed its container. It is symbolic closure, a polite way of informing our imagination that its services are no longer required.

A culture in which symbols loop prides itself on clarity. Everything is carefully labeled, contextualized, and explained. Stories arrive pre-interpreted. Metaphors are accompanied by disclaimers. Myths are treated as early drafts of science, charming but obsolete. Ambiguity is regarded as a design flaw. The public is protected from confusion with the same enthusiasm once reserved for protecting it from ignorance. And so, our symbolic environment grows increasingly hygienic, scrubbed free of excess meaning, stray resonance, and the dangerous possibility that something might be understood differently than intended.

This process is rarely experienced as oppression. On the contrary, it is widely celebrated as progress. After all, what reasonable person would object to accuracy, fact-checking, or epistemic responsibility? Only a fool, one assumes, would prefer mystery to knowledge, or

uncertainty to certainty. In this eagerness to be reasonable, our culture quietly abolishes the conditions under which imagination operates. It forgets that creativity does not flourish in perfectly lit rooms, but in half-shadow, where meanings blur and unexpected connections form.

The result is a peculiar kind of creative impotence. Not the absence of content, never that, but the absence of genuine novelty. There are stories everywhere, endlessly streaming, but they feel strangely familiar even when they are new. Worlds are constructed with immense technical skill, yet they resemble one another with the uniformity of a well-regulated suburb. Characters speak in voices that sound suspiciously like position papers. The imagination works hard, but it is always working within a fenced enclosure. It is permitted to decorate, but not to redesign.

At this point, nostalgia enters the scene, not as sentimentality, but as structural necessity. When a culture can no longer generate new symbols capable of carrying meaning, it returns to the last era when symbols still worked. The past becomes a quarry from which usable forms are extracted, polished, and resold. Entire industries arise devoted to the careful preservation and recycling of familiar worlds. These are called “universes,” a term that would once have implied boundless possibility but now indicates a closed system with strict internal regulations.

Nostalgia is comforting because it asks nothing of us. It offers coherence without risk, recognition without effort. One already knows how to feel about these symbols. They have been pre-approved by memory. The culture reassures itself that it is honoring tradition, when in fact it is compensating for a failure of symbolic invention. It is not that the past was better. It is that the present is symbolically exhausted.

This exhaustion is intensified by the rise of what might be called ontology policing. In a looped symbolic environment, every story is evaluated not for what it opens, but for what it affirms. Does it align with the accepted picture of reality? Does it avoid confusion? Does it send the correct signals? Fiction, once a playground for speculative thought, is increasingly treated as a potential vector for error. The line between narrative exploration and deception collapses. One must be careful, now, what one imagines.

Our inability to distinguish between fictions that deceive and fictions that illuminate is among the more ironic achievements of modern rationality. Our culture is so concerned with guarding against false beliefs that it forgets that imagination is not belief. A myth is not a claim about the world; it is a way of orienting oneself within it. In a system obsessed with literal truth, this distinction is lost. The symbol must either be true in the narrowest sense or not permitted at all; and so, stories are flattened into messages, metaphors into examples, and wonder into trivia.

The consequences for creativity are predictable. When imagination becomes self-conscious, when it must continually justify itself before an internal tribunal of reasonableness, it loses its vitality. The question that once drove storytelling, "What if?," is replaced by safer inquiries. Is this accurate? Is this appropriate? Is this allowed? The imagination, now supervised, learns to behave. It produces content that is polished, responsible, and entirely forgettable.

This is not because artists have lost their talent. It is because the symbolic atmosphere in which they work has grown thin. Creativity requires what might be called semantic slack, or a margin of looseness in which meanings can drift, collide, and recombine. Without this slack, symbols harden. They become precise but brittle, and brittle symbols shatter under the slightest pressure of novelty.

One of the first casualties of this process is wonder. Wonder depends on the experience of encountering something that exceeds one's conceptual grasp. It is not the result of ignorance, but of humility. Yet humility is difficult to sustain in a culture that treats explanation as conquest. Everything must be accounted for. Nothing is allowed to simply be strange. Our modern fascination with exposing the mechanisms behind art, myth, and experience, how it's made, how it works, what it "really" is, operates as a kind of anti-mythology. The veil is lifted, and beneath it we find not deeper mystery, but workflow charts. This relentless demystification is defended as enlightenment. Indeed, it does dispel certain illusions, but it also dispels the sense that reality is larger than our models of it. The world becomes manageable but also dull. A culture that knows how everything works eventually forgets why anything matters.

Fiction, under these conditions, struggles to remember its purpose. Its original function was not entertainment, nor instruction, but exploration. Fiction was the laboratory of the imagination, the place where unreal possibilities could be tested without immediate consequence. It allowed societies to rehearse futures, examine fears, and encounter truths that could not yet be stated directly. But when symbolic systems become rigid, fiction is reassigned safer roles. It may distract, or it may instruct, but it must not disturb.

Thus, fiction becomes either a palliative, soothing the audience with familiar pleasures, or an instrument delivering approved messages. What disappears is the third function, fiction as revelation through deviation. Stories that do not fit neatly into existing categories are quietly discouraged. They are difficult to market, difficult to explain, and worst of all, difficult to control.

A civilization that loses this function loses its ability to imagine futures that are not merely extensions of the present. It becomes trapped in its own assumptions, endlessly refining them, but never escaping them. This is what creative impotence looks like at scale. Not silence, but noise without transformation.

However, this condition is not irreversible. Symbols are not static objects; they are living processes. They can be reopened. Our symbolic field can be made porous again, if our culture is willing to relax its grip on certainty. This does not require abandoning truth, only abandoning the belief that truth must always be literal, singular, and fully articulated.

One step in this direction is the recovery of mythic permission, the collective agreement that stories may exceed facts without thereby becoming lies. That a narrative may be meaningful without being reducible to a statement. That ambiguity is not a failure, but a feature. Such permission does not undermine reason; it complements it, restoring a balance that rationality alone cannot sustain.

Another step is the acceptance of symbolic plurality. Reality does not submit gracefully to a single metaphor. It requires many, sometimes contradictory, ways of being understood. A healthy symbolic ecosystem tolerates this multiplicity. It does not rush to reconcile every difference. It allows symbols to overlap, interfere, and evolve.

Ambiguity, too, must be rehabilitated. It is fashionable to speak of clarity as a moral virtue, and in some contexts it is. But clarity without depth is merely transparency, and transparency without mystery is exhaustion. Ambiguity creates space for participation. It invites the reader, the listener, and the viewer to complete the meaning themselves. In doing so, it restores imagination as a shared activity rather than a consumable product.

Most of all, our culture must relearn how to generate new symbolic primitives. Not new versions of old forms, but genuinely new metaphors capable of holding contemporary experience. This is difficult, because new symbols are unsettling. They do not come with instructions. They cannot be immediately verified. They ask us to dwell, for a time, in uncertainty. Without this discomfort, no symbolic renewal is possible.

To imagine is to risk being wrong. To create is to step beyond the boundaries of the known. A civilization that fears this risk will inevitably stagnate. It will become very good at managing itself, and very bad at becoming something new.

A society that forgets how to dream does not collapse overnight. It continues functioning, producing content, enforcing norms, and maintaining coherence, but beneath the surface, something essential withers. Our capacity to envision alternatives fades. Our future becomes a rearrangement of our past. And our symbols, looping endlessly, congratulate themselves on their stability.

Our task, then, is not to destroy our symbols, but to loosen them. To let them point outward again. To allow them to gesture toward what we do not yet understand. In doing so, we may recover not only creativity, but humility, the recognition that reality is larger than our explanations, that imagination is not an indulgence, but a necessity.

If we can remember this, if we can reopen the symbolic frontier and allow mystery back into our thinking, then creativity may yet return. Not as spectacle, not as nostalgia, but as the quiet, disruptive force it has always been, the means by which human beings adapt to a world that refuses to remain still.